

From: Greg Cunneen
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 12/27/01 7:52pm
Subject: Reward or punishment

There are extremely large numbers of computers in the world, all of which become obsolete within 2 to 3 years. Many are recycled into other products, many are dumped, yet many get donated to institutions (like schools). The advantage of getting school kids "hooked" on a particular system are obvious; they continue to use what is familiar to them in later school years and adult years.

"Punishing" Microsoft by allowing it to hijack the sole remaining competitive market seems very strange to me. Not only does it kill off the other legitimate businesses (the ones that did not break the law), it will naturally lead to increased sales for Microsoft in the future for the reason stated above in paragraph 1.

As a rule, I do not use Microsoft products unless absolutely necessary. I admit my bias. Unfortunately, their products are now so dominant that it is impossible for me not to use them (because everyone else uses them too). I don't know the technical definition of a monopoly, but I cannot think of any other industry that is so completely dominated by one company.

And I cannot help but think that if Microsoft were not an American company, say Taiwanese or Japanese, everyone in US political circles would be bending over backward to nobble the foreign entity to ensure valid competition. Instead, Microsoft ends up being rewarded.

Where is the justice in that?

Greg Cunneen